REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated December 18, 2002 in which the Examiner objected to the drawings, rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejected claims 5-7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and rejected claims 8-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner acknowledge the Information Disclosure Statement filed August 27, 2002.

Concurrently filed with this Amendment is a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes in order to label Figure 7 prior art. It is respectfully requested that Examiner approves the correction and withdraws the objection to the drawings.

As indicated above, a minor informality in claims 10 and 11 have been corrected. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner approves the corrections and withdraws the rejection to claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

As indicated above, a typographical error has been amended in claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 5 does not narrow the lateral scope of the claim and is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 5 claims a method of holding an electronic part and claims 6 and 7 claim a method of manufacturing electronic parts. The methods comprise a step of holding an electronic part or substrate on a surface of an elastic material, in which at least the surface of the elastic material is adhesive as claimed in claim 7 and adhesive and conductive as claimed in claims 5 and 6. In claims 6 and 7 the element on the substrate is mounted and electrically connected while the substrate is held on the surface of the elastic material.

Through the method of the claimed invention holding an electronic part or substrate on a surface of an elastic material in which at least the surface of the elastic material is adhesive or adhesive and conductive, as claimed in claims 5-7, the claimed invention provides a holding method and manufacturing method for electronic parts in which the generation of electrostatic charges is prevented. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 5-7.

Claims 5-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Iliou et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,616,413).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Iliou et al. appears to disclose a process for manufacturing printed circuits with an individual conductor rigid metallic support. (col. 1, lines 12-14) A substrate presenting an appropriate dielectric constant is selected for a printed circuit board and is cut out into the desired dimensions. This substrate is a flexible substrate and is copper plated on two faces. At the moment of chemical engraving of the printed circuit, one of the two faces is appropriately protected and engraving is performed on the other face. Preferably, for the use at UHF, a layer of good-electricity conducting metal, such as gold, is deposited on the conductors of the printed circuit in order to avoid the drawbacks of the skin effect. Furthermore, the rigid metallic plate is prepared that must support the flexible plate of the printed circuit. In the present example, this rigid plate is of aluminium, and its dimensions

are advantageously larger than those of the printed circuit: thus there is no need to effect a very accurate positioning of the flexible plate with respect to the rigid plate, and the excess glue produced during the subsequent stage of subjecting it to pressure does not risk overflowing on to the adjacent equipment. The two plates are thus ready to be stuck together. Preferably, the gluing material used is an electrically conductive epoxide adhesive film, such as the film "Ablefilm ECF 550". This film is cut out to the dimensions of the flexible plate, while preventing any contamination during its handling. Once the rigid plate and the flexible plate for the printed circuit have been removed from the oven, the cut-out adhesive film is rapidly positioned between the faces to be stuck of these two plates, and immediately a pressure is applied to the assembly of the two plates and the adhesive film disposed between them. (col. 2, lines 14-68) The sticking is completed by placing the said assembly in an oven, to harden, and subjecting it to constant pressure, in the range of 1 kgf/cm^2. In the case where the said film "Ablefilm ECF 550" is used, this hardening stage is, preferably, carried out at 120° C during about 4 hours. Finally, the printed circuit and its support are machined in order to obtain a rigid plate having correct dimensions and in order to produce, more especially, holes for the passage of fixation screws for the plates on the chassis or in a housing and, where necessary, holes for receiving the ends of the connecting wires of the components to be welded onto the printed circuit, these components being, of course, disposed on the "copper" side of the printed circuit. (col. 3, lines 13-27)

Thus, *Iliou et al.* merely discloses sticking together two plates together using a gluing material such as an epoxide adhesive film and applying pressure. Thus nothing in

Iliou et al. shows, teaches or suggests an elastic material, the surface of which is adhesive as claimed in claim 7 or an elastic material, the surface of which is both adhesive and conductive as claimed claims 5 and 6. Rather, *Iliou et al.* merely discloses a gluing material such as film Ablefilm ECF 550 (i.e., an elastic material is **not** a gluing material, an adhesive or a bond).

Since nothing in *Iliou et al.* shows, teaches or suggests an elastic material having a surface which is adhesive or adhesive and conductive as claimed in claims 5-7, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and recites additional features. It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 would not have been anticipated by *Iliou et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Iliou et al.* in view of *Oehmke* (U.S. Patent No. 4,098,945). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Iliou et al.* in view of Applicants admitted prior art. Claims 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Iliou et al.* in view of *Kazuo et al.* (Japanese Reference 11-045912).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for

reasons which will be set forth below it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As indicated above, since nothing in the primary reference shows, teaches or suggests an elastic material or a surface of an elastic material is adhesive or adhesive and conductive as claimed in claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the secondary references with the primary reference will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 8-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New claims 15 and 16 have been added and recite additional features. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration an allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: _____
Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 12, 2003

Attachment to Amendment dated March 12, 2003

Mark-up of Claims 5, 10 and 11

5. (Amended) A method of holding an electronic part or a component constituting the electronic part, comprising:

holding said electronic part or a component constituting the electronic part on a surface of an elastic material, in which at least the surface of [a] said elastic material is adhesive and conductive, by the adhesive strength of said surface.

10. (Amended) The method of manufacturing electronic parts according to claim 7, wherein [the] a holding jig comprises heat-resistant material having a heat-resistance temperature of about 250°C.

11. The method of manufacturing electronic parts according to claim 7, wherein [the] a holding jig includes a laminate structure of a hard plate and the elastic material.